of the Andhra Pradesh High Court would not be applicable as they proceed upon the basis that there is a conflict between the Industrial Disputes Act as amended by the enactment of Section 2A and the Andhra Pradesh Shops and Establishment Act, 1966 enacted subsequent to the enactment of S. 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

16. Thus in view of the above said discussion I hold that it is amply proved by the I Party that the dispute in this case is an Industrial Dispute and that this court has jurisdiction to determine the same. Hence my finding on the Additional issue No. 2 is the affirmative.

17. In view of my findings on the two preliminary issues, I direct the case to be heard and disposed of on its merits with reference to the other points and issues in this case.

Typed to my dictation, then corrected, signed and pronounced by me, this the 21st day of October, 1978.

C. N. RAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Mangalore.

Order No. SWL 206, LLA 78 Bangalore dated the 6th Feb. 1979.

Whereas by State Government Order No. SWL 318/LLD 77 dated 7-6-77 the Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Padival Bros., Bunder, Mangalore-1 was referred to the Labour Court, Mangalore, for adjudication ;

And Whereas the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Mangalore, has submitted to the State Government its award in respect of the said Industrial Dispute.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Karnataka are pleased to direct the publication of the said award as above, in the *Karnataka Gazette.*

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Karnataka,
B. T. SATHYANARAYANA,
Under Secretary to Government,
Social Welfare and Labour Dept.

P. R. No. 887.

A.T.I.—M.B.

4